



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/384,371	08/27/1999	BRENDAN MURRAY	52817.000091	7713

29315 7590 09/25/2003

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003

18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/384,371

Applicant(s)
MURRAY ET AL

Examiner
Patrick N. Edouard

Art Unit
2654



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 21, 2003
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 8, 15, 22, and 29-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 8, 15, 22, and 29-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 17 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2654

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filed 2/21/03 (paper#16). Claims 1, 8, 15, 22 and new claims 29-34 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35

Art Unit: 2654

U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shakib et al (5,778,213).

As per claims 29 and 32, Shakib et al teach a method of evaluating characters in a message comprising:

“Receiving a plurality of characters, each character associated with one or more languages” (figure 3, his receive user request 30, col. 4, lines 10-31);

“Providing each character in said plurality of characters to a character table bank” (figure 1, his first table 17 comprising row and column, col. 1, lines 59-65, col. 3, lines 18-28)

“Receiving at least one indicator from said characters table bank, wherein said character table bank receives a character as input and provides at least one indicator corresponding to a pre-determined character set which each character can be rendered” (col. 4, lines 17-24, col. 3, lines 18 to col. 4, lines 9)

“Comparing said at least one indicator for character to determine a character set in which a plurality of characters can be rendered” (col. 4, lines 32-67).

Art Unit: 2654

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al (5,778,213) in view of Martino et al (6,216,102) and Marshall (WO 92/15067).

As per claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 Shakib et al et al teach a method of evaluating characters in a message, comprising the steps of

“an input interface to accept an input of the characters of the message...one or more languages” (figure 2, his receive user request 30, col. 2, lines 10-31);

“A processor unit, connected to the input interface , the processor unit evaluating the message by individually comparing each of the characters of the character...candidate character set and the message” (col. 3, line 17 to col. 4, line 10 and lines 32-67).

It is noted that Shakib et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach computing a weighted total number of characters matched to each of the plurality of predetermined candidate characters set by applying a weighted factor... to a pre-determined value for the weighted total number of characters matched. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Martino et al who teach at col. 12, line 15 to col. 17 lines 45, a method of

Art Unit: 2654

determining the language of a document wherein the set of words are compared to words in a plurality of word tables in which the table is a $n \times n$ bit table where each bit represent a given letter pair at a particular place in a word on one of the languages and determining the letter value from the tables for the given candidate language and adding to the running total. The largest language total is selected to indicate the most probable language for the document. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to organize the table of Shakib as a $n \times n$ word table as taught by Martino because it would provide a system capable of efficiently identify the language of a document with a word table that used less memory.

It is further noted that the combination of Shakib et al with Martino teaches the claimed but does not explicitly teach wherein the processor unit evaluating the message tests the ability of each of the plurality of pre-determined candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical operation between the bit mask that identifies...the message. However, this feature is well known in the art. as evidenced by Marshall who teach in the abstract the testing for a character match is effected by combining the possible record of a character of the substring being examined in which the combining operation involving forming an intermediate translated bit mask. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into the combination of Shakib et al with Martino a translated bit mask as taught by Marshall because it would provide a system capable of matching records even when the character items in the string are tested against the pattern that can be varied.

Art Unit: 2654

7. Claims 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al (5,778,213) in view of Marshall (WO 92/15067).

As per claim 30, It is noted that Shakib et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach wherein said character table bank receives a character as input and provides a bit mask... said character". However, this feature is well known in the art. as evidenced by Marshall who teach in the abstract the testing fro a character match is effected by combining the possible record of a character of the substring being examined in which the combining operation involving forming an intermediate translated bit mask. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into Shakib et al a translated bit mask as taught by Marshall because it would provide a system capable of matching records even when the character items in the string are tested against the pattern that can be varied.

8. Claims 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al (5,778,213) in view of Marshall (WO 92/15067). and Ozbutum et al (6,141,656).

As per claim 31, it is noted that the combination of Shakib with Marshall teaches the claimed but does not explicitly teach " wherein said comparing comprises "ANDing" said bit mask for each character...render said character". However, this feature is well known in the art as evidence by Ozbutum et al who teach the ANDing of bitmap streams from segmented bitmaps at col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 14 and col. 8, line 17 to col. 9, lines 10. Therefore one having

Art Unit: 2654

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into the comparing steps the ANDing as taught Ozbutum et al because it would provide a system capable of performing efficiently logical operation on bitmap streams for segmented bitmaps in a database bitmap index.

9. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shakib et al (5,778,213) in view of Martino (6,216,102).

It is noted that Shakib et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach computing a weighted total number of characters matched to each of said plurality of predetermined candidate character sets by applying a weighted factor to the number of characters matched. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Martino et al who teach at col. 12, line 15 to col. 17 lines 45, a method of determining the language of a document wherein the set of words are compared to words in a plurality of word tables in which the table is a nxn bit table where each bit represent a given letter pair at a particular place in a word on one of the languages and determining the letter value from the tables for the given candidate language and adding to the running total and the largest language total is selected to indicate the most probable language for the document. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to organize the table of Shakib as a nxn word table as taught by Martino because it would provide a system capable of efficiently identify the language of a document with a word table that used less memory.

Art Unit: 2654

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Art Unit: 2654

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington.

VA.,

Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold, can be reached on (703) 305-4379.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 872-9314. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's voice mailbox (telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

August 8, 2003



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PATENT EXAMINER